

### Remarks

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8, 14-29, 32-41, 44, and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application 2004/0172255 of *Aoki et al.* ("*Aoki*") and U.S. Patent Application 2004/0201710 of *Uchihashi et al.* ("*Uchihashi*").

Claims 9-13, 30, 31, 42, and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Aoki* and *Uchihashi* and U.S. Patent Application 2002/0191071 of *Rui et al.* ("*Rui*").

The examiner has objected to claim 9 prompting applicant's amendment to claim 9.

The examiner has objected to figure 3 because it does not include an element 13 mentioned in the description. It is submitted that since the rich media environment 13 is shown in figure 1 as originally filed, the objection to figure 3 should be withdrawn.

The examiner has objected to figure 5 because it does not include an element 252 mentioned in the description. In response, applicant has provided a corrected figure 5.

The examiner has objected to figure 6 because it includes an element 310 but not an element 360. In response, applicant has provided a corrected figure 6 that properly refers to the camera 310 and the individual 360 as described in the specification.

The examiner citing 37 CFR §1.75(d)(1) and MPEP §608.01(o) has objected to the specification and has stated that it does not provide a proper antecedent basis for "computer readable storage media" recited in claims 34-45. It is respectfully submitted that 37 CFR §1.75(d)(1) clearly states that the claim terms must find clear "support or antecedent basis..." (emphasis added). It is submitted that applicant's specification provides clear support for a computer readable storage media as claimed in claims 34-45 because any person skilled in the pertinent art would be well-knowledgeable of how to make and use a computer readable storage media as claimed in claims 34-45 from reading applicant's specification. MPEP §608.01(o) states that "The specification should be objected to if it does not provide

proper antecedent basis for the claims..." (emphasis added). It is respectfully submitted that applicant's specification provides a proper antecedent basis for claims 34-45 because any person skilled in the pertinent art would be well-knowledgeable of how to make and use a computer readable storage media as claimed in claims 34-45 from reading applicant's specification. MPEP §608.01(o) does not require an antecedent basis for individual terms used in the claims but instead provides that individual terms should "have clear support or antecedent basis in the specification..." (emphasis added). Applicant has shown that the specification provides support for a computer readable storage media.

It is respectfully submitted that that *Aoki* and *Uchihashi* do not disclose or suggest using respective sets of sensing and rendering components that cover the physical movements of multiple individuals in respective first and second environments to detect multiple communication interactions and combine media data in response to activities indicated by their physical movements as claimed in amended claims 1, 22, and 34. Instead, *Aoki* discloses analyzing audio streams to detect conversations among individuals positioned at their computers (*Aoki*, Figure 1 and paragraph 11) or enclosed in a room (*Aoki*, paragraph 167) and *Uchihashi* discloses a source analyzer controller 30 that assists an operator to detect a communication interaction in a conference room (*Uchihashi*, paragraph 22).

The examiner has acknowledged that *Aoki* does not teach detecting physical movements of individuals but has stated that *Uchihashi* does and that it would have been obvious and advantageous to combine the movement detection of *Uchihashi* into the system of *Aoki*. (Pages 7-8, Office Action, 2-26-08). It is respectfully submitted that movement detection as taught by *Uchihashi* would not benefit the system of *Aoki* because the system of *Aoki* detects conversations by analyzing audio data. (*Aoki*, "conversation communication" at paragraph 11 and "audio streams" at paragraph 12 and "vocalizations" at paragraph 167). It is submitted that in the context of the teachings of *Aoki* detecting movement as taught by *Uchihashi* is irrelevant. One could in theory modify the system of *Aoki* to detect physical

movements but those movements[1] would not be used in the audio analysis taught by *Aoki*.

Moreover, any such combination of would still lack the limitation of using coverage of physical movements to detect multiple communication interactions in a first and a second environment and to combine media data in response to physical movements as claims in amended claims 1, 22, and 34. *Uchihashi* does not teach using physical movements to detect multiple communication interactions among individuals in a first and a second environment. Instead, the source analyzer controller 30 of *Uchihashi* only assists an operator in pointing a camera toward an activity of interest in a room. (*Uchihashi*, "The candidate event activity is then provided to the operator in an intuitive format facilitating the selection of the appropriate camera capable of capturing the second speaker" at paragraph 22).

Given that claims 2-21, 23-33, and 35-45 depend from amended claims 1, 22, and 34, respectively, it follows that claims 2-21, 23-33, and 35-45 are not obvious in view of *Aoki* and *Uchihashi*.

It is also submitted that claims 9-13, 30, 31, 42, and 43 are not obvious in view of *Aoki* and *Uchihashi* and *Rui* because claims 9-13, 30, 31, 42, and 43 depend from amended claims 1, 22, and 34 and *Aoki* and *Uchihashi* and *Rui* do not disclose or suggest the limitations of amended claims 1, 22, and 34. Applicant has shown that *Aoki* and *Uchihashi* do not disclose or suggest using respective sets of sensing and rendering components that cover the physical movements of multiple individuals in respective first and second environments to detect multiple communication interactions and combine media data in response to activities indicated by their physical movements as claimed in amended claims 1, 22, and 34. *Rui* teaches aiming a camera in response to user selections (see

---

1 *Aoki* at paragraph 33 suggests that biometric data may be used to detect conversations but it is submitted that biometric data is not data pertaining to physical movements of individuals within a first and second environment as claimed in amended claims 1, 22, and 34. Instead, biometric data refers to measurements of the physiology of an individual (paragraph 33 of *Aoki*), e.g. heart rate, temperature, etc. The physical movement detected by *Uchihashi* is not biometrics. (See paragraph 23 of *Uchihashi*).

abstract and figure 1 of Rui) rather than using respective sets of sensing and rendering components that cover the physical movements of multiple individuals in respective first and second environments to detect multiple communication interactions and combine media data in response to activities indicated by their physical movements as claimed in amended claims 1, 22, and 34.

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5-29-08 By:   
Paul H. Horstmann  
Reg. No.: 36,167